



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/125,700	10/23/1998	THOMAS FUHRMANN	200-008181-U	8084
7590	01/04/2005		EXAMINER	
NOKIA, INC. 6000 CONNECTION DRIVE MAIL STOP: 1: 4-755 IRVING, TX 75309				CHIANG, JACK
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/125,700  
Filing Date: October 23, 1998  
Appellant(s): FUHRMANN ET AL.0

**MAILED**  
JAN 04 2005  
Technology Center 2600

Stephen J. Wyse  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER**

1. This is in response to Appellants' Reply Brief filed 09/03/04.


2. ***Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is **correct**.

Note: The examiner would like to apology to the appellant for the typo made in the original Examiner Answer mailed on 06/30/04.

3. The examiner would also like to reiterate that **all the rejections** (pages 7-18 in Examiner Answer mailed on 06/30/04) are **ISSUES ON APPEAL**. All these rejections had been presented to appellant many times before, and appellant had presented argument on all the rejections before, therefore, none should be considered as a new ground of rejection.

Further, appellant had the opportunities to comment on all the rejections when filing the Appeal Brief on 04/01/04 and the Reply Brief on 09/03/04, and all the issues raised in the Appeal Brief and the Reply Brief had been addressed in the Examiner Answer dated on 06/30/04.



JACK CHIANG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER